

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 34-43 are added. Support for new claims 34-43 can be found throughout the Specification, for example, in Fig. 7 and Example 2. No new matter is added.

Claims 1- 33 are cancelled.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 34-43 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 12 and 33 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 12 and 33 are cancelled. The claims objections are now moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. § 112

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-4, 9-14, 19, 21, 24, 28-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-33 are cancelled. The 112 rejections are now moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U. S. C. §§ 102& 103

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US 2002/0132047, hereafter "Yamazaki"). Claims 1-2, 4, 11-14, 24 and 33

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Phillips et al. (US 4,889,319, hereafter “Phillips”), further in view of Yoshiro et al. (English translation of JP2002-310302, herein “Yoshiro”). US 2007/0037922 and 3, 113,778 are cited for definition of perfluoroelastomer. Claims 3, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and Yoshiro, further in view of Hisaharu et al. (English translation of JP06-107803, hereafter “Hisaharu”). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and Yoshiro, further in view of Kenichi (English translation of JP03-189290, hereafter Kenichi). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillips and Yoshiro, further in view of Ohmi (US 5,863,842), hereinafter Ohmi). Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiro and Phillips, further in view of Yamazaki et al (US 2002/0132047, hereinafter Yamazaki). Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiro, and Phillips, further in view of Jabbour (US 2003/0026601, hereinafter Jabbour).

Claims 1-33 are cancelled. The 102 and 103 rejections are now moot.

New claims

Claims 34-43 are added.

Independent claim 34 recites “ A vapor deposition apparatus for use in depositing an organic EL layer,... the first gasket and the fifth gasket are formed by a perfluoroelastomer, and the second, third, and fourth gaskets are formed by metal or ceramic.” Claims 35-41 recites features further limiting the apparatus as claimed in claim 34.

Claim 42 recites “a method of depositing an organic emitting layer (EL) onto a substrate, using a vapor deposition apparatus according to claim 34, comprising evaporating an organic EL element material contained in the deposition source container to a substrate placed in the process chamber.” Claim 43 recites features further limiting the method as recited in claim 42.

Yamakazi teaches to remove impurities in the original organic compound by heating (paragraphs 0021-0025), however, fails to teach an airtight apparatus as claimed in claims 34 and 42.

Phillips teaches a bakeable sealing means comprising a first sealing element composed substantially of an elastomeric material, a second sealing element comprising PTFE (polytetrafluoroethylene), and means for engaging the first sealing element with the second sealing element and for compressing the first sealing element (column 2, lines 43 to 48). From this fact, it is readily understood that Phillips teaches an individual improvement of each sealing means which is included in the molecular beam epitaxy apparatus, by forming each sealing means by different materials, such as the elastomeric material and the PTFE. However, no teaching is made at all in Phillips about an apparatus which comprises a plurality of seal members or a plurality of gaskets formed by materials different from each other. In other words, Phillips never considers a total system of the apparatus comprising a plurality of seal members or gaskets. Further, Phillips fails to teach or disclose a method of depositing an organic EL as recited in claims 34 and 42.

Yashiro discloses a sealing material formed by fluororubber copolymer which contains tetrafluoroethylene and propylene as a polymerization component and unsaturated radical. However, Yashiro also fails to disclose a combination of different sealing materials used in an apparatus, as recited in Claims 34 and 42.

Hisaharu, Kenichi, Ohmi, and Jabbour are cited for disclosing other features of the claims but fails to cure the deficiencies of Phillips and Yoshiro explained above.

Thus, none of Yamakazi, Phillips, Yashiro, Hisaharu, Kenichi, Ohmi, and Jabbour teaches a combination of different sealing materials used in an apparatus, as recited in Claims 34 and 42. And further, none of Yamakazi, Phillips, Yashiro, Hisaharu, Kenichi, Ohmi, and Jabbour teaches depositing an organic emitting layer (EL) using such an apparatus as recited in claims 34 and 42.

Other dependent claims recite features further limiting claims 34 or 42, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons.


Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 1/23/2008

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,072